THEOLOGY

VOL. LIV SEPTEMBER, 1951 No. 375

Editorial

WHEN did one last read a book in which so many passages had to be marked for remembrance and further reflection as Professor Paul Tillich's *The Protestant Era* (Nisbet, 21s.)? This is a book which might become as significant for a whole theological period as was Harnack's *What is Christianity?* It is a collection of essays, which cover a large range of subjects, but they have a profound coherence. They were mostly written within the context of American Protestantism, and are the result of its impact upon a mind that is unmistakably German but at the same time unusually open and responsive to new experiences. The title of the book hardly suggests the extent to which questions are posed which need to be asked about all forms of Christianity and by Christians of every tradition. The word "prophetic" is easily abused, but this is "prophetic theology" if there be such a thing—searchingly critical but also seminal.

"*The usual question, 'What shall we do?' must be answered with the unusual question, 'Where can we receive?*' People must understand again that we cannot do much without having received much. Religion is, first, an open hand to receive a gift and, second, an acting hand to distribute gifts" (p. 185; italics in the original). That may look as though it is directed primarily against American activism, as indeed it is, but it ought to get under the skin of all of us. Tillich is something more than a "neo-orthodox" theologian. He stands beyond the fret and fever of "anti-liberalism". He knows the insufficiency of such slogans as "Back to the Bible" and "Back to the Reformers". He perceives that the tasks of the philosopher and the theologian are complementary, and not antithetical, to one another. He realizes that the problem of ethical standards or norms is not to be solved simply either by returning to absolutism or by accepting relativism; the New Testament categories of "kairos" and "agape" chart a way that carries one beyond both these too simple solutions. He does not imagine that in order to exalt grace it is necessary to depreciate nature. In fact, one of the best things he does is to indicate ways by which that meaningfulness of nature which scientific method misses can be rediscovered. Closely connected with this is his clear recognition of the inescapably natural elements in both the Word and the sacraments. He has some devastating things to say about Protestantism's reduced valuation and virtual loss of the sacramental, but "catholics" who may be tempted to crow over this and other exposures of the poverty of Protestantism should first make sure that they have reckoned what is being said to them and, in particular, with Tillich's affirmation of the permanent necessity of the Protestant principle.

"The most important contribution of Protestantism to the world

in the past, present, and future, is the principle of prophetic protest against every power which claims divine character for itself—whether it be Church or State, party or leader. Obviously, it is impossible to build a church on the basis of a pure protest, and that has been the mistake of Protestantism in every epoch. But the prophetic protest . . . has to be expressed in every situation as a contradiction to man's permanent attempts to give absolute validity to his own thinking and acting" (p. 231).

"To remain a member of a Protestant church does not mean remaining a real Protestant" (p. 232). The Protestant principle needs to be affirmed and continually reaffirmed within Protestantism as well as within Catholicism. Tillich hints that the Anglican communion has a special opportunity of holding together dialectically the spiritual substance of Catholicism with the prophetic protest of Protestantism, but also a special danger of pretending that it is doing so when it is doing nothing of the kind. "Is the middle way of the Episcopalian church a new creative way, or is it the way of a compromise, uniting the weaknesses of both side?" (p. 272). As the Rev. R. H. Daubney, Vice-Principal of Ely Theological College, who contributes a useful introduction to this English edition, says: "The question of the catholic elements in Protestantism and of the protestant elements in Catholicism is endowed with a new seriousness after reading Tillich's work, and the concern for the recovery of the Christian tradition in its wholeness acquires more vital importance" (p. xvi).

This is a big book and a stiff book, but it is worth a great many little books, and it should whet the appetite of many readers for Professor Tillich's *Systematic Theology*, publication of which is due to begin before long.

The Gospel, Women, and the Church—I

The grace and truth of the Gospel are for all mankind, men and women. All are called to behold the glory of that revelation in Christ; all are called to witness to it. Yet, in the Church there are orders from which half of mankind, the female half, is debarred. Is this rejection a simple expression of an order of creation, of the fact of hetero-sexuality? Or does the Church reflect uncritically the age-old patterns of social and cultural discrimination?

This is a "problem" and a "question" for the Church rather than for women as such. It is a "question"—literally, *quaestio est*—for the Church, for it is a testing of the spirit by which the Church lives. For women—that is, for those women who profess and call themselves Christian—there is no problem beyond that of being rejected, which, presumably, is no new thing for a disciple of our Lord. The field of service is wide; the call to apostolic witness without benefit of clergy still may be heard, and there are countless women of diverse gifts who have laboured and not reckoned their labour to be vain, even if it has not earned them honour from or parity with their brethren in the Church. The "problem", or the "question",

then, confronts the Church, not women. As with the pressing concerns of race and colour, the "question", the testing, and the judgment must begin with the house of God. This "question" which our generation must ask the Church is whether its ecclesiastical practice, as well as the rationale thereof, is of the Gospel. The Gospel of glory, under whose rays of light no distinction stands between Jew and Greek, bond and free, male and female, calls all discrimination in doubt. The Spirit of grace and truth, who shall lead to all freedom, has he been heard in what he shall say to the churches?

The measured words of the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford challenge consideration of this question. In his foreword to the published university sermons on *Should Women Be Priests?* by R. W. Howard, Dr Hodgson wrote:

> "I am myself one of those who hold with Canon Howard that the ordination of women to the priesthood and their consecration to the episcopate is a step forward which our Lord is urging upon his Church, and I believe that sooner or later the whole Church on earth—Orthodox, Catholic, and Protestant—will hear and be obedient to his voice."

But, as he admits, "the subject is . . . charged with emotional dynamite" and discussion often is obscured by the fears and taboos which too easily cling even to those of the household of faith. Yet upon some is laid the burden of raising questions. To quote Canon Howard,

> "Must the threefold ministry remain man's last, inviolable stronghold? Is that God's will? Emotional preference and respect for Church tradition led me at first, as I am sure they still lead a majority (now steadily decreasing) of Church people, to answer 'Yes' " (*op. cit.*, p. vii).

There are many reasons why this viewpoint is so general. Viewed from the outside, there are many obvious explanations. Religion, with its sanctification of custom and historic use, often is conservative. The authority of Biblical and primitive use is a restraining force in the face of radical criticism. Again, the comparative youth of the so-called women's movement perhaps suggests that the Church *in time* will see the light of reason, if not of glory. As the legal and medical professions slowly and reluctantly have let down their bars and have admitted women on a token and representative basis, if not on terms of full equality, so perhaps in time that most closed of all corporations, the ordained ministry of the Christian churches, might admit women to the apostolic fellowship.

Many of these explanations obviously have point and validity. There is enough evidence from anthropologists, sociologists, and psychologists, as well as historians, to support such criticisms or explanations of what might be regarded as the obscurantism of the Christian churches. But for the Christian, the question must not be debated along these lines alone. Instead, it must be placed in the context of the Gospel. As in the first age of Christianity, it behoves the individual Christian disciple, as well as the Church in its corporate consciousness, to ask the question in humility and honesty, "Who was I, that I could withstand God?"[1]

[1] Acts 11. 17.

In the New Testament the Gospel of glory is the Gospel of freedom. The Gospel sets men free from the bonds of law, and also from judgments "after the flesh". The law often embodies judgments "after the flesh"—that is, human, partial, and contingent viewpoints; but in the New Testament, the Gospel is set against both law (the principle of law rather than the particular content thereof) and the tendency to judge "after the flesh". Thus, the Gospel challenges the Pharisees and Scribes, who walk according to tradition, and who bind the burden of law upon the people, so that the service of God becomes the performance of religious and moral duties. But also the Gospel judges the judgments of men; Peter is called Satan because "he minded not the things of God but the things of men".[1] In the fourth gospel the Pharisees judge "after the flesh"; their rejection of our Lord's witness to his own mission is "according to the flesh";[2] that is (so Sir E. C. Hoskyns comments), "it is merely human judgment, and lacks the necessary spiritual insight which will belong to his true disciples".[3] For the true disciple, indeed, as St Paul claims, "We know no man after the flesh . . . for old things . . . are become new."[4] Against this background of the Gospel, what can be said for the attitude which puts women outside the walls of the house of God? To-day, the question of St Peter to the Apostles and brethren at Jerusalem presses for answer: "If, then, God gave unto them the like gifts as also unto us, when we believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I, that I could withstand God?"[5]

There are some in the Church who would not grant the first hypothetical clause: "If, then, God gave unto them the like gifts as also unto us. . . ." At the present time there are many priests and bishops, as well as layfolk, in the Anglican communion, who regard womanhood as having some quality inherent in it which disqualifies it for a like visitation of the Holy Ghost. The Bishop of Dorchester writes:

> "Sex, as honourably understood, occupies a far more central place in female human nature than in the male. Women as such radiate a sex atmosphere in a way which men do not.
>
> "Hence the appearance of women as leaders in worship and in the administration of Sacraments would entirely revolutionize the tone of public worship. Such a change would destroy the sexless impartial character which at present marks it and would induce an element of distracting earthliness. It is not necessary to insist on the tragic consequences which might too easily ensue. The predominance in the female temperament of emotion, instinct, and varying moods—all this wholly delightful in society, on the stage, and in the home—would be out of place in the pulpit, in the confessional, and at the altar."[6]

The distressing conclusion to be drawn from this passage is that womanhood, incarnating "earthliness" or sexuality, is not part of the human nature redeemed by Christ. Such a viewpoint would demand a rewriting of much of Christian theology, and even of the New Testament. Nevertheless, this attitude (even if as quoted above it is almost a caricature, yet) in more or less measured expression is the rule rather than the exception. At the last General Convention of

[1] Mark 8. 33. [2] John 8. 15. [3] E. C. Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 378.
[4] 2 Cor. 5. 16–17. [5] Acts 11. 17.
[6] *Girls' Friendly Society Review*, May 1939.

the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A., which was held at San Francisco in 1949, the House of Lay Deputies voted to disbar the seating of elected women. (At the previous General Convention, one woman, the first, had been seated.) A priest of the Episcopal Church wrote in answer to a somewhat critical editorial in the fortnightly journal *Christianity and Crisis* as follows:

> "As a member of the Lions International, I would not want women in the club, but that does not say or infer that the Lions International is against the emancipation of women. Those who belong to the Masons do not allow women to their meetings, but provide a sister organization for them. The church, making room for the contribution of its lady members, does provide groups and committees through which they make their contribution to the church. . . .
>
> "If you happen to think that the Episcopal Convention is denying women the right to work in the church it is because you have not followed what the women do. It is not a case of being exclusive, but being practical. Consider the business transacted, and you will understand that. . . .
>
> "Conventions such as Lions or the Masons could let women do the same work, but it happens to be done by men. It is not a case of being exclusive, but again practical."[1]

What conception of the Church does this imply? It must be remembered that this statement was not apropos of whether women were fit for ordination, but merely that they were not deemed even suitable enough as lay representatives in the Church. It is hard, and perhaps neither useful nor here relevant, to guess whether such views upon women's disability arise from bondage to law and tradition, or represent judgments "according to the flesh". On the whole, such viewpoints, expressed from the more Catholic side, are related to interpretations of natural law and of tradition and precedent in the Church from New Testament times on. Protestant expressions rely rather heavily upon the authority of St Paul, particularly upon those statements which describe the subordination of woman and even the necessity of her being veiled. But, without being unduly psychological in critical analysis, it is safe to suggest there is more than an element of judgment "after the flesh" even in professedly theological or ecclesiastical statements.

It is not surprising to find such judgments after the flesh echoed fairly consistently. Christian theologians, traditionally male, traditionally also have tended to be concerned about the femininity of sexuality of women. It is tempting to put down much in the centuries of ecclesiastical celibacy to psychological motives of compensation, but it would be over-simplifying to make St Paul, Gregory of Nyssa, St Jerome, or St Augustine—when they wrote upon virginity, for example—merely the victims of occupational bad consciences. Neither would such interpretation explain why such a concern lingers so persistently to-day, when such psychological conditions no longer exclusively obtain, and when the whole climate of opinion provides no like force of historical or social conditioning. Turning from Anglican to other theologians in non-Roman Christianity, there is Professor Otto Piper, in his most useful book, *The Christian*

[1] *Christianity and Crisis*, vol. ix, No. 20, 28 November 1949, p. 159.

Interpretation of Sex, commenting on Ephesians 5. 23 as follows:

> ". . . there is, as it were, a 'demon' of sexuality in woman's life. This is seen in the fact that, by contrast with the man, the entire physical being of a woman is conditioned by the sexual functions, and she can therefore make sex into a self-sufficient sphere of life; or rather, it gains such power over her that her conduct is unavoidably conditioned by it. She may become a prostitute, i.e. a sexual being as such (here it is immaterial whether she is a public prostitute or whether she abandons herself to her sexuality in a manner more or less recognized by society). There is nothing corresponding on a man's side."[1]

It is interesting that Dr Piper, in spite of his respect for the words of St Paul, does not comment upon Rom. 1. 27, which, presumably, refers to male "sexuality". Dr Piper's book was written before the publication of the Kinsey Report on the *Sexual Behaviour of the American Male*, yet the story of Don Giovanni might have served as a traditional reminder of the fact of male sexuality, to which also law and literature bear evidence.

It is the underlying attitude expressed or implied in passages such as these with which the Christian should be concerned. It is not, for instance, the biological fact of woman's sexuality with which Dr Piper deals. Biologically, of course, woman's life and organism *is* interwoven with sex and potential motherhood. Racially and reproductively, sex, the essential element in woman, is in man accessory. But this obvious fact is not the question in debate. Rather it is that sex and woman are somehow outside the first reaches of God's grace in creation or redemption. Does this not suggest a limiting of the full Christian doctrine of creation? If the earth be the Lord's, and the fullness thereof, surely Christians, whether bishops, theologians, or lay, should glorify God and give thanks for the variety of that fullness, rather than set bounds and patterns of discrimination on the basis of the sex preferred by the Lord? The sense of such passages as those quoted above is that the Almighty prefers men, who are, or presumably can be, "spiritual" and "un-sexey", rather than women, who oddly enough might be "womanly", but even more distressingly might be "earthly" and irradiated with "sexuality", to serve him in the ministry of the Word and the sacraments. Such a point of view is obviously Gnostic, with the suggestions of ranks and degrees of spirituality. Yet, as such, it exists implicitly in remarks made *en passant* or in casual reference, or explicitly in considered pronouncements by the Church or Christian people. For women thus outlawed from participation in the ordained ministry of the Church there is the parable of the Sheep and the Goats, always so comforting to those who officially are deemed and dubbed "goats". In the Kingdom of our Lord women may figure, as they did so notably at the Crucifixion and Resurrection. According to the Gospel record, save for the Johannine mention of the disciple whom Jesus loved, and to whom Jesus committed the care of his mother, none of the disciples watched the agony of the Cross. Women who had ministered to him in the days of his flesh were more faithful than the disciples, who "all left him, and fled", and witnessed the

[1] Otto A. Piper. *The Christian Interpretation of Sex*, 1941, p. 73.

sacrifice of the flesh, as they also, on the first Easter morning, rose early to anoint his sacrificial and crucified flesh. Perhaps there is a deep irony here. It was the Incarnate Flesh of our Lord which a woman "anointed aforehand for the burying"; it was the Incarnate Flesh of our Lord to which the faithful women ministered in the days of his preaching and journeyings. The Incarnate Flesh, crucified and risen, to this also the woman witnessed. Yet, this very right of ministration, which our Lord allowed, is denied by the Church, which claims to be the Body of Christ. Presumably the woman who brake the alabaster cruse of ointment and poured it over the head of our Lord was as "womanly" and as "earthly" or as full of "sexuality" as woman described by the Bishop of Dorchester or Dr Piper above. Yet (oddly, it must appear to them) our Lord allowed and approved the action. "And verily, I say unto you, wheresoever the Gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, that which this woman has done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her."[1]

If attitudes such as those suggested in the passages quoted above be heretical on the basis of Christian belief in God as Creator, what then may be said on the basis of the doctrine of Redemption? Does the brother for whom Christ died exclude the sister from being called to witness and to proclaim the saving grace of that death? The often quoted, but sadly not exceptional, remark made by a Canon in the Convocation of York that "the very thought that the chalice should be administered by a woman made him shudder"[2] must be judged first as a sin against the charity of God, which the disciple seeks to emulate. Secondly, such an attitude judges the one who expresses it: "Who art thou that judgest the servant of another? To his (or her?) own lord, he (or she?) standeth or falleth." St Paul's further words may be added: "I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus, that nothing is unclean of itself; save that to him who accounteth anything unclean."[3]

In the light of the gospel of glory there is nothing common or unclean, save to him who accounteth anything unclean. The only explanation for such attitudes as those reflected above is that there is a deep, perhaps unconscious, fear of the creative or generative aspect of sex which the woman embodies. Christianity always has had to struggle against the fear of creation and of creativity; the battle of the Church with Gnosticism is not a closed chapter, and only a positive Trinitarian theology "neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the substance", can dispel spurious spiritualizings of the dogmas of Creation and Redemption. If the Church implies, by her official attitudes, as well as in the viewpoint of her accredited ministers, sub-Christian attitudes upon woman, sex, the body, and the association thereof with creation and generation, then her official concern with the sanctity of the home and of the family is misplaced, and to the world outside appears hypocritical.

In marriage, more than in any other relationship of life, there is the intermingling of soul and body, spirit and flesh. The deep

[1] Mark 14. 9. [2] See *Should Women Be Priests?* cf. P. R. Smythe, *The Ordination of Women*, 1939, p. 146. [3] Rom. 14. 4, 14.

truths of the Gospel that man (or woman) cannot live to himself (or herself) alone; that dying to self is the only way to life with the other; that, in the economy of love, abundant honour is accorded to the less comely parts of physical existence; these are also the truths of married life, "that there should be no schism in the body, but that the members should have the same care one for another".[1] St Paul was speaking of the Church, the body of Christ, but surely the words apply to married man and woman, who, so our Lord reminds us, are "one flesh"? But in such a relationship there can be no subordination, either of person or of part, aspect or function. The honouring of each other in love precludes the setting of standards as to which is higher or lower, either by the Church or by the individual. The setting of such standards violates the very nature of the mystery of exchange and substitution, which is true marriage, and which to many others besides St Paul is a symbol of the union between Christ and his Church.

The Church, therefore—in which, ideally, there is neither male nor female, but only disciples of Christ—not only debars many from her accredited ministry, but also allows her voice to be discounted by countless others, who need the good news of redemption in their married or family lives, because of these contradictions which exist within her own attitude.

As so often in the history of the Church, the Spirit speaketh to the Church from outside, and declares that judgment must begin with the house of God. Many a modern marriage, which is not confessedly Christian, has demonstrated the deep courtesies of love and honour in its fabric, which, according to Christian truth, is a compound of flesh and spirit. Many of the thousands of veterans who have served in crowded quarters with their wives in the universities and colleges of the United States have shown a mutual sharing of the domestic problems and responsibilities—as well as of the joys—of family life. As the provisions of the Government in many cases did not cover the needs of a family with children, the wife and mother had to take a full or part-time job, and became, while the husband completed his education, the wage-earner. Where this happened, the husband and father was the one to stay at home, and combined child-care (meals and fetching from nursery school) with his lectures and studies. If these young men had held the attitudes which distinguish so many bishops, priests, or laymen of the Church, doubtless their marriages, either as social achievement or sacramental expression, could not, or would not, have been so "Christian". It is no wonder, therefore, that the secular world views with detachment or amusement pronouncements, for example, on the sad state of marriage and the family, from a Church which lacks the courtesy even to allow women as lay deputies to her assemblies on the tacit assumption that they belong to some lower order of creation. Striking proof of this assumption as of this general attitude can be found if the Church be compared with other realms of our corporate life. Many women can bear witness to the relief they feel when leaving the

[1] 1 Cor. 12. 25.

atmosphere of avuncular condescension tinctured with that ecclesiastical bonhomie which so often characterizes the gatherings of the Church, to move freely in the world of business, government, or academic life, where the attitudes "after the flesh" at least are not sanctified by law, precedent, and ecclesiastical example.

The discussion of this problem challenges the Church and her members to ponder anew the mystery of God's grace in creation and redemption.

URSULA M. NIEBUHR.

(To be concluded)

Three Wiltshire Parsons, 1796-1900

A. N. WHITEHEAD once assured a Harvard audience that he was a typical Victorian Englishman, and proceeded to demonstrate how his life and thought had emerged out of a clerical background in the far-off rural England of the sixties. Incidentally, the same thing could and should be done for other eminent philosophers influential in their time and therefore still part of our time. Thus the trio of Oxford idealists, T. H. Green, B. Bosanquet, and F. H. Bradley, all grew to manhood in a vicarage and proceeded to a small public school. Such scrutiny of origins is both interesting and valuable since, as Whitehead says, generalized history often sadly misrepresents the real stuff of human life and the real thought-world of the quiet people in the back streets and country parishes. The present steady flow of books on the country parson is not so superfluous as their superficiality sometimes suggests; they are better material for the more philosophical reader than their gaudy illustrations may imply; they provide, to use one of Whitehead's favourite metaphors, part of the evolving pattern of the nature and destiny of man. The record of every "behaviour-pattern" does its part in transmitting the "tonality" of the whole society in which our own roots grew. The biographical notes which follow certainly seem to confirm Whitehead's thesis. Better than the biographies of bishops or scholars they may help us to sense the "tonality" of English rural life as it was and to contemplate with equanimity the inevasible future. For one impression made by the research behind these notes is the complete absence of any reference to the great men and the notable movements which fill the pages of the generalized church histories. Parochial incidents, agrarian disturbances, agricultural prices—yes; but of the Oxford Movement, of the controversies with Dissent, of the misdeeds of Mr Gladstone and so on, not a word. There surely at the outset is one instructive lesson from a study of this particular "behaviour-pattern" in a definite but typical locality. Our period, 1796–1900, covers the incumbencies of three vicars of Britford, a parish and an estate but hardly a village, still intact and unspoiled among the water-meadows of the Salisbury Avon; the cathedral tower and spire glow in the setting sun scarcely a mile from the vicarage back garden. The family connexions of these three vicars give an additional unity

beyond that derived from their succession in the benefice. The parsonage is a modest and pleasant homestead built *c.* 1740, having on the east side a spacious circular lawn surrounded by a yew hedge. The patrons are the dean and chapter, the income *c.* 1900 was £175 net; the incumbents have served as chaplains of the Poor Law Institution for the last century or more.

i. *Robert Morres* (1756–1841), son of Thomas Morres of Hinckley, Leics., took his B.A. at Brasenose College in 1777, was elected fellow of that college 1781, and was Bampton Lecturer in 1791. From Isleworth, Middlesex, he came to Britford in 1796. His long life bridges the transition from the England of George III to the hungry forties, from the quiet years before 1789 through the Reform agitation on to Peel's "betrayal" of the Country Party. He was almost contemporaneous with Sydney Smith, who concentrated a great deal of history into a remark he made to the young Mr Gladstone about the time of Morres' death, "Whenever you see a clergyman of my age you may be sure he is a bad clergyman." From a miniature oil portrait within a heavy gilt frame Robert Morres surveys the present vicarage drawing-room with an austere and supercilious stare. Beneath the long, lean aristocratic nose are pursed firm, rather petulant, lips. There is no clerical neckband, but a dark high-collared coat; it might be a portrait of General Wolfe or of some French émigré. Morres was a child of the century in his pluralism and non-residence. Along with Britford and the chaplaincy of Longford Castle he held Great Cheverell, some thirty miles distant. He was an official of the Ecclesiastical Court and acquired a prebend of Salisbury Cathedral. Possibly (or presumably) he stayed at Cheverell, but resided after his wife's death in 1801 at Wokingham, Berks, visiting Britford to deliver series of discourses at Lent or Advent; after 1817 the duties were fulfilled by a succession of curates or officiating ministers.

In contrast, however, his preaching savours definitely of the post-revolutionary era when Tory ministers and evangelical churchmen were leading the nation out of the deism and radicalism of the later decades of the previous century. Morres is credited with some twelve items in the British Museum catalogue. His eight Bamptons (on Faith) were published in 1794. Fifty years later, in the year of his death, he put forth *Observations Addressed to Christians of the Church of England*. Between come collections of *Discourses* and *Sermons* and an *Essay on Human Happiness* (1838). *The Address of a Minister of the Church of England to his Parishioners* (1799) was "respectfully inscribed to the Friends of True Religion and Government"; it was reprinted by the author's family in 1843. Its eighty pages provide an excellent specimen of the prevailing style of homiletics during this uneasy period. It is firmly theological in an evangelical sense, properly anti-Romish, but reserves its severest strictures for "those idle, turbulent, discontented men" who "pretend to reform abuses or to restore the constitution" but in fact lead astray "unsettled and credulous minds". "Let France, let Holland, let Italy and Switzerland testify that where men of such description are suffered to take their course, though the land be as a Garden of Eden

before them, they will leave it behind them as a desolate wilderness." It is the voice of the preserver of things-as-they-are through the centuries. But there are also paragraphs in admirable eighteenth-century prose elaborating the close connexion between social stability and the personal exercise of neighbourliness, honesty, industry, and piety.

ii. *Richard Humphry Hill* (1800–68) was not Morres' immediate successor, though the parishioners ardently hoped he would be. He had been curate since 1827 and for fourteen years had served the parish with exemplary faithfulness in things sacred and secular. The "behaviour-pattern" takes shape between the lines of his diary.

> Nov. 1830. Our labourers to a man struck for an advance of wages.
> Nov. 1831. The cholera morbus made its appearance.
> Christmas, 1831. Procured a supply of blankets for the poor on account of the spreading of cholera.
> 1841 Spring. Six houses burnt down in the pits; a subscription made for the sufferers, £40.
> 1847. Cholera again made its appearance. A meeting of farmers called and decided to clean the drainage of the parish.
> 1848. Exceedingly wet and the potato disease more than usually destructive.
> 1849. Aug. This month the Queen visited unfortunate Ireland.

On Morres' death Hill might well have expected the appropriate reward, but Canon Bowles, the parson-poet of Bremhill, secured the presentation of a young colleague and Hill preached his farewell sermon in April 1842 "to an overflowing congregation from the words, 'Finally, brethren, farewell' ". We may smile, but we should pause to reflect. Curates have their difficulties to-day; so had they then. Hill was now 42 years of age, his family then or later numbered sixteen (of the nine sons who survived infancy five were eventually ordained). He must vacate the parsonage; no other benefice was offered, and for five years he seems to have taken occasional duty at a neighbouring parish and served the chaplaincies of Longford Castle and Salisbury Workhouse; they must have been indeed years of austerity. However, he returned as curate to Britford in 1847 and served two more years until the death of Morres' successor. This time fortune was more favourable; Canon Hamilton offered him the living, which he accepted subject to the condition that East Harnham, two miles away, should be separated from Britford—though such reorganization would reduce his income by £50. (The foundation stone of the pleasant neo-Gothic church of East Harnham was laid two years later and the building completed at the charges of Mrs Lear, widow of the famous dean. One of Hill's sons, Geoffry, became vicar in 1891 and is still remembered as a musician, cricketer, angler, author, and Liberal; he died in 1926.)

On 9 January 1850, therefore, R. H. Hill became *de jure* what he had long been *de facto*: vicar of the parish. Yet income still lagged behind the necessities of his position and his ambitions for his sons, who one by one were sent to Oxford. Sydney Smith in his country parsonage said he wished he had twenty children, but his income at the time was in the region of £1,500. Even in days when income tax

was negligible, food cheap, and dilapidations premiums unknown, the balancing of Hill's budget would appear to have been an impossible achievement. A partial explanation doubtless lies in his renting of the rectory farm which adjoins the vicarage—the farmhouse is still as left by the builders in 1580 and is a perfect gem of Elizabethan domestic architecture. This small dairy farm was managed for him by young Charlie Crook and no doubt provided the bulk of the food consumed at the vicarage. The tenancy expired on Hill's death and the account of some of the purchases at the sale still survives; the squire bought four of the cows, "Squirrel", "Damsel", "Primrose", and "Beauty", at about £15 each. Even so there was little or nothing left in the deceased's estate. Yet had he left a fortune he would have left less than the nine sons, the four daughters, the poor fed, the sick tended, the souls saved, in the parish which as his memorial tablet records he had served as curate and vicar for nearly forty years. One parishioner wrote simply and beautifully, "and he gave us much love and thoughtfulness". He died on 4 February 1868, and was buried by his eldest son.

On this vacancy, as contrasted with the disappointment in 1841, the succession was quickly and happily decided. Five days after announcing his father's death, T. S. Hill wrote again to Squire Jervoise, thanking him for his condolences, and adding, "The faces at the vicarage will not I am thankful to say be quite strange to you; the living has been given to Arthur Morres, and he and my sister come from St Nicholas and make this still a home for Jane and Francis. We flatter ourselves this will not be altogether unacceptable to our squire."

iii. *Arthur Philip Morres* (1835–1900) will be known to many for whom Kilvert's *Diary* provides periodical refreshment of spirit. "To-day after twenty-three years I went to Britford again. . . . Soon I saw approaching the two Morres brothers, soldier and priest, who married the two sisters, Misses Hill, of Britford vicarage. They gave me a hearty welcome and we turned to walk to the village. They had hospitably kept breakfast on the table for me. . . . The vicar has in his house a fine collection of stuffed birds, among which are a pair of peregrine falcons shot on the spire of Salisbury Cathedral when the steeple was being restored." So runs the entry for 11 July 1874. Kilvert came again on 25 August 1875, and as he went to his sleeping quarters at the old manor house he heard the bishop's bell from the palace toll out deep and solemn to call the household staff to evening prayers. " 'And why', ask the Dissenters, 'should I be waked out of my first sleep at ten o'clock because the bishop wants to say his prayers?'." Against that echo of old, unhappy, far-off things we may set the picture of Kilvert loitering down by the water-meadows that same evening, admiring "the marvellonus aerial spire", and observing a hobby, i.e. a falcon, sweeping down from the wooded hills to his hunting ground by the streams, while overhead a heron slowly flapped his way from Longford Castle woods. Still to-day the solitary wanderer may see what Kilvert saw. The next day he attended the South Wilts archery contest in the field south of the vicarage, and

the day following he and Morres walked up the Avon valley to Stonehenge—"a solemn and awful place".

To Kilvert's entries we may add the commentary. Arthur Philip was a grandson of Robert Morres; he was born at Wokingham and was at Winchester College under Moberley, his future bishop. While chaplain at St Nicholas Hospital, Salisbury, he became engaged to Mary Ann, the second daughter of R. H. Hill; his brother Eliot, the soldier, married Susan, another daughter. Thus on Arthur's preferment Mary Ann Hill became mistress in the home of her childhood; the years ahead seemed to stretch out fair and far. Then the fates delivered their blow; three months later a stroke, almost fatal, permanently affected her limbs and her speech. Yet, says a niece in a recent communication, with the aid of a chair she moved about the parish and was often "to be found praying in the church". Their first child, a daughter, was taken from them in infancy. Two boys grew up to whom at school their mother wrote every day with her one usable hand. Then, another blow, the elder, Elliot Arthur, now head boy at Sherborne, caught a cold and died in his eighteenth year. Less than two years later the mother, saying her prayers by her bedroom fire, was severely burned by a flying coal, and though the wounds healed another stroke carried her off in her fifty-fifth year. Morres married again and enjoyed five years of happiness, resigning his benefice in 1894 and taking up again the chaplaincy of St Nicholas. There a little son was born and died; a week later the mother died also. "Still", writes his niece, "our dear uncle's faith never faltered and he seemed only to grow sweeter as his life drew to its close." He died suddenly while on a visit to London on 14 October 1900; his own memorial stone was added to the group of Hill and Morres graves in the south-east corner of the churchyard. His nephew, Guy Morres, formerly rector of Wishford, now in retirement at Wylie, is godfather to the present vicar's small daughter—a very tenuous link with one of the most lovable and accomplished of his predecessors.

For, as Kilvert implies, and as memories confirm, Arthur Morres was both versatile and single-minded. His chief claim on the gratitude of posterity is his preservation of the ancient Saxon and Decorated church in 1873 at a cost of some £2,600, of which he himself provided almost a fifth. The architect was the then much-respected G. E. Street, and the "restoration" was careful and conservative; it would have been less conservative and more destructive had there been more money available—a fortunate circumstance only to be fully appreciated by those who have seen Street's plans. Morres also set on foot the provision of a chapel at the Salisbury Workhouse—a project carried to completion by his successor, T. J. Woodall (vicar 1894–1928). After 1873 followed twenty years of faithful and efficient pastoral care, as the parish registers and, again, memories testify. What is now—for so the pattern unwinds—little more than an expiring hamlet was then (and was until 1939) a lively, active, churchgoing, simple-minded rural community. Of such quiet discharge of duty history is normally oblivious. Yet it has its colourful reliefs; the

pattern if quiet is not dull. Morres amply fulfilled the parson's dual role of leadership in things temporal and spiritual; sometimes the two spheres were joined, as when he chose a new sexton from Winchester as being a valuable recruit to the cricket eleven. Morres was himself a keen cricketer, a gardener, a clever draughtsman, and if not a poet a ready versifier; his "Jubilee Hymn" of 1897 enjoyed a considerable circulation.

But above all he was a naturalist. The larger of two portraits in the parish archives shows him examining some insect, the smaller blowing an egg. As his niece puts it with admirable brevity, "All nature was in his heart". The passion began at Winchester and ardour at length achieved real eminence; he was known to ornithologists and entomologists throughout the county and farther afield; he contributed to learned periodicals, he lectured indefatigably, much of his private collections went to the Salisbury Museum. There is indeed a legend in the parish that he was "the man who embraced a spider". The interpretation thereof has no reference to Mary Hill, but to the fact that as she and her bridegroom were moving from the altar to the west door he suddenly left her side to dart to the corner of a pew, having espied and captured some rare species of insect. The evidence supporting the truth of this tale appears to be conclusive, and since it is apparently part of the "behaviour-pattern" of the naturalist in holy orders, we may add another for which the evidence is quite irrefutable. The fortunate few who know Mrs Ida Gandy's study of *A Wiltshire Childhood* (1923) will remember how her father, C. W. Hony, vicar of Bishop's Cannings 1873–1907, who loved two sorts of parishioners, those who lived in cottages and those in the hives on the glebe, suddenly stopped in his sermon, descended from the pulpit, moved down the aisle, removed a bee entangled in a woman's bonnet, continued his march to the west door, released the bee, returned to the pulpit and continued his discourse. That tiny drama one would have given much to behold.

When Arthur Morres died, Canon H. C. Powell, rector of Wylie 1882–1901—his treatise, *The Principle of the Incarnation*, is still worth study—wrote an obituary in the *Guardian* in which he truly observed that Morres' love of nature was part of his ministry of souls, that the meadows of Britford are as full of memories of him as are the fields around Selborne of Gilbert White, and he concluded with a sentence as simple as it is profound: "Such men do good in the world by means of all that is in them, and in the church their memory is blessed."

A kindly and informed critic of the rural clergy, possessing by a curious coincidence the same name as the present writer, but otherwise unconnected (William Addison, *The English Country Parson*, p. 153), suggests that the Oxford Movement restored "light to the altar" but not "warmth to the pew". "It succeeded in the chancel: it failed in the homes of the common people." Whatever denial or qualification we may wish to make, no one who knows the condition of our rural parishes to-day will deny there is some truth in the epigram. As between John Keble and Charles Kingsley the countryman

will never hesitate. The squire or farmer or country storekeeper, whether a conscientious churchwarden or a merely nominal churchman, is very similar to the vestryman in Australia who wrote to the bishop during a vacancy, "What this parish needs, bishop, is a good slow left-hand bowler." Kingsley, yes; Keble, no. We may regret the preference, but there it is. But that the false antitheses—holiness and manliness, piety and versatility, sanctity and secularity—are really resolvable and that their synthesis ensures an acceptable and fruitful ministry in every passing generation is, we suggest, proved and illustrated by the lives of such men as R. H. Hill and A. P. Morres. And that ideal of ministry as broad as it is high is of course as old as the Christian Church itself: "There are diversities of gifts . . . of ministrations . . . of workings, but it is the same God that worketh all things in all."

W. G. Addison.

Messianic Prophecy[1]

My subject is Messianic prophecy, that is to say, the predictions of Christ in the Old Testament. No one speaks from the pulpit for any other purpose but to publish the truth of God; and it is with the aim of knowing God himself that we must speak of Messianic prophecy. We have sufficient warrant. We are Christians, and for us to know God is to know Christ. And Christ made himself, his work, and his glory, known to men by an appeal to Messianic prophecy. The beginning of wisdom is to acknowledge Christ as what he claimed to be, that is, as Christ, the Messiah, the Lord's Anointed. And if the Old Testament had not taught to Israel the expectation of Messiah, the foundation on which Christ built would not have been there.

It is unquestionable, therefore, that the Spirit of God effectively proclaimed the Messiah through the Old Testament. The whole sense of Scripture, working by the power of the Spirit on believing minds, revealed the Messianic promise. That is a simple matter of history. And it is important to distinguish this plain historical fact from a whole range of secondary questions which admit of doubt. It is clear that, through the whole sense of Scripture, God taught the Messiah to the Jews. It is not necessarily so clear that this and that Scriptural text was Messianic to the prophet who originally conceived it or wrote it down. The fact of Messianic prediction is proved by Messiah's having been effectively predicted, and not by any dogmatizing about the original sense of "A virgin shall conceive" or "Behold my servant whom I uphold". The original senses of Old Testament texts are the objects of a praiseworthy historical curiosity, but the inspired word of God for us Christians is the instrument through which God taught that Israel among whom Christ came.

I said that our purpose here is to understand God himself, his

[1] A sermon preached before the University of Oxford in the Hilary term, 1951.

action and his ways, how he has bestowed himself and spread abroad his grace through Messianic prophecy. Now God is his own interpreter: we understand one field of his action best by comparing it with another field of the action of the same God; the two will cast light upon one another, and so upon the God who is displayed in both. And what I shall do here is to draw out the parallel between God's self-revelation in prophecy and his self-revelation in nature. Scripture itself makes the comparison. *Caeli enarrant*—"The heavens declare the Glory of God"; but also in the same psalm, a little below, "The testimony of the Lord is sure, giving wisdom unto the simple". And the prophet makes the comparison more directly: "I am the Lord thy God, that stirreth up the sea, that the waves thereof roar; the Lord of Hosts is his name. Moreover, I have put my words into thy mouth, and covered thee with the shadow of my hand; that I may be he who planteth the heavens and layeth the foundations of the earth, and saith to Zion, Thou art my people."

The first point I will make about revelation by prophecy and revelation in nature is the inadequacy of anything like argument or proof to set forth the form of either. There was a time when theologians argued confidently from the works of nature to prove that their author was divine, and supposed the proof to be logically cogent. And in the same way, and with the same mind, the same men argued from the miraculously exact predictions of Jesus Christ in the Old Testament, and drew the supposedly inescapable conclusion that he was the Incarnate Word. Both arguments can be broken and refuted by consistent unbelief, and for the same reason. If the whole thought and conception of a divine author and first cause is eradicated from a man's mind, then the very questions to which the creator is given as the answer can be rejected as superfluous or illegitimate. All reasoning from nature towards God is the recognition of God displayed in his handiwork; it is a reasoning from God to God, from God seen in nature to God considered in himself. If God is not seen, or half seen, in the beginning of the argument, he will not be seen at the end of it either. As with the light of the sun. From the manifold reflections and radiations of his light, from the world of colour spread over the whole face of things, a child may learn to appreciate the power of the sun; and apart from these tokens, the sun might seem nothing but a hurtful and stabbing point isolated in the blue expanse. But all this reasoning from the reflections to the original presupposes the sun actually there and diffusing his light. Blot out the sun himself, and there are no reflections by which the knowledge of him can be recovered. And so it is with our mental picture of the world. If the divine idea is utterly blotted from the mind, it is no longer reflected in anything, and all evidence perishes. But, happily, it is not so easy as some persons suppose to exclude every vestige of the divine idea from every level of the human soul.

As the reflections of God in nature point back to, and enliven and confirm, our idea of the first cause and primal bounty, so the shadows of Christ in prophecy point the Christian back to Christ. But here again the same condition holds: the shadows of Christ in

prophecy can only be seen as such if we have the body and substance of Christ in the Gospel. Blot Jesus Christ out of the scripture and the Messianic anticipations bear no longer any clear or single sense. There remains nothing but a conflicting pile of hopes and images, some beautiful, some barbarous and strange; pictures of Israelite world empire, of a new David, of a jewelled city floating from the sky; motives of sacrificial piety and of bitter self-vindication. True, we may speak, as we did speak, of God's Spirit drawing this matter together and preaching Messiah to the Jews before Messiah came. But that spiritual preaching needed to be fixed and clarified by the actual coming of Christ. Without the Christ of flesh and blood, the Jewish foresight of him is a flickering and transitory gleam. It is in the light of Christ himself that all Messianic prophecy is understood.

I will continue the comparison between Christ foreshown in prophecy and God displayed in nature, by taking a further point, namely this: that in both fields revelation moves from multiplicity towards unity. The image of the sun and of its radiations will serve us here once more. The whole power and glory of the sun is in the sun, but gathered and concentrated in such a simplicity of incandescent splendour as to baffle our eyes. We turn from the sun, and range over the variety of his innumerable effects, the universe of warmth and growth and light. We gather and collect our impressions, we carry them back and up into their source, and so we enrich our perception of the power of the sun. And thus it is with our knowledge of God through the works of nature. The dazzling simplicity of his being is extended and shaded and pluralized through the variety of his works, and we gain some conception of his glory by gathering the effects of God's act and drawing them back into his act, into the simplicity of absolute power in which they are all prefigured.

So it is again with the many figures of Messianic anticipation and the one Christ. Christ has the intense and blinding simplicity of God. Every circumstance of his life, every word and action, is clear, simple, and meaningful without end. In his death and resurrection all divine truth is summed within a few events. Here is too much light, too much truth, too much reality drawn into a point. But it was never the intention of God that this blinding simplicity should confront the unprepared mind. He had extended, and shaded, and scattered the truth of Christ in the manifoldness of the messianic images; and those who saw and believed Christ were inspired to draw together into him all this universe of anticipated meaning. What had the promise of a new temple signified? What but the flesh of Jesus Christ, wherein God truly inhabited? Who else but he was the marvellous child, the token of deliverance and bearer of the name *God-with-us*? All the atoning blood that ever ran down under the altar of Solomon, what had it been but a shadow of the death of Christ? And so one could continue endlessly.

It is no mere speculation or construction on our part to say that the disciples of Christ understood Christ by seeing his glory scat-

tered in the Old Testament, and by gathering all those scattered lights into his divine splendour. This is no speculation of ours; it is what the men of the New Testament, and Christ himself, manifestly did. The legal and controversial type of mind has misinterpreted the New Testament, just as it has misinterpreted the vision of God in his works. We look upon the works of God to see God, not to prove him, and the primary purpose of the apostles, say of St Paul, when they looked into the Old Testament, was not to demonstrate Christ thence, but to see Christ there. Certainly when they saw Christ in the Scripture it had the force of evidence, for seeing, after all, is believing; and they laboured to show him to others there, that they too might believe. They gathered, or collected, Christ from the Old Testament by the light of the Holy Ghost, and they called upon others to submit to the same illumination. It was not, of course, the manhood of Christ that they collected from the Old Testament. The man stood before them; they took him in with their eyes and ears. It was the supernatural act and being of God in Christ that they sought in the ancient text, where all the images of divine action and divine indwelling were displayed. It is the Godhead that dazzles and blinds, that drives our eyes from the centre towards the circumference, to judge of the centre from there; to judge of him that sits upon the throne from the rainbow that surrounds his majesty.

I shall advance a third point of comparison between knowing God from his works and knowing Christ from the prophetic shadows of him. I will show that what is called the coincidence of opposites occurs in the second no less than in the first. How is it that a certain coincidence of opposites arises in a conception of God collected from his works? It arises through our inability to see how the diversity of the creatures is prefigured in the simplicity of the Godhead. We find several similitudes of God in the world, and we run them all back to their source in God, and we say that God is that very point in which these several lines of glory meet, and are united in a single being. Certain things in the world, and certain aspects of the world, suggest to us the ideal of changeless permanence, of exemption from the tyranny of process, sequence, time. Other things, and very different things, present us with the ideas of consciousness and life. Nothing here below, nothing that we can remotely conceive, can combine life and changelessness in a single being. The changeless does not live; the living changes by the very act of living. Nevertheless we define God by the coincidence of these opposites; he is that changelessness which lives, or, he is that life which does not change; *Deus est sua vita*, but also *Deus est sua eternitas*. And this coincidence of opposites in God is not a difficulty about the idea of God; it is the idea of God. It is not something to be cleared up in a philosophical footnote; it is something to be set in the middle of the theological page, and proclaimed as the hallmark of Deity. God is God, God transcends our world and our conceiving; therefore his being holds together in unity what neither our world nor our mind can truly unite.

Ascending, then, from the creatures to God, we fall into a coin-

cidence of opposites. But so we do in advancing from Messianic anticipations to Jesus Christ. Christ is seen to be God incarnate, and no bare creaturely fulfilment of the prophetic types, by everywhere forcing opposites into an undreamt-of union. To take a famous example. The story of Abraham's sacrifice is wholly based on the distinctness and oppositeness of the two sacrificial victims, Isaac and the ram caught in the thicket. Isaac was a moral sacrifice, not actually offered. The ram was a slaughtered sacrifice, but morally no more than a token. Isaac is human obedience and self-oblation; the ram is divine mercy and providential redemption. Isaac is the *υἱὸς ἀγαπητός*, the only or Beloved Son: the beast is the *ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, the Lamb of God which takes and bears the sin, the indebtedness, of man, that man may live. The whole meaning of the story, in its Old Testament dress, turns on the distinction between these two figures. The New Testament, again and again, points to the ancient story, but only to show that in Christ the opposites have coincided; the beloved son and the Lamb of God are one. The merciful redemption and the willing self-oblation, human devotion and divine deliverance, death and the exclusion of death—all these are one, when the Son of God is also the Son of Mary, and voluntary death achieves resurrection.

Another example, and one more obviously prophetic, more obviously Messianic. Daniel predicted and Enoch elaborated the deliverance of the suffering saints by the advent of the Son of Man. The sufferings were referred to Israel in this age, the glory of the Son of Man to the advent of King Messiah. This was the pathos of the picture: the sufferers looked for a deliverer; and the deliverer came in power divine and irresistible. But Christ, gathering up all things in himself, *omnia in semet ipso recapitulans*, taught this lesson to St Peter: "The Son of Man must suffer", the sufferings are his as well as the glory, he is both the martyrdom which calls forth the intervening mercy, and also the mercy which intervenes.

The coincidence of opposites in Christ differs for us in a marked way from the coincidence of opposites in the being of God above all worlds. Both are marvellous, but the one marvel is enacted, as it were, before our eyes; the other is invisible. We have not seen the beatific vision, we have not appeared before the face of God nor traced all the rays of glory back to their coexistence in the substance of glory. But the work of Christ is revealed, it is what we have heard, what we have seen with our eyes, says St John, what we have surveyed and what our hands have handled of the Word of Life. We have made the pilgrimage through the prophecies and arrived at Bethlehem and Calvary; but the pilgrimage through the creatures and through all worlds to the Throne of Glory we have not made; we have not finished it, that is; we are still upon the road. Even so, our thoughts outrun our feet, and aspire after the apprehension of our goal, that living unity who draws all the riches of diversity into himself.

I will take another point of comparison between nature pointing to God, and prophecy pointing to Christ, and I will call it "signs" or

"indications" of deity. When we survey our natural environment, we encounter two sorts of things which speak to us of God, which I will call respectively signs and evidences. The evidences suggest God by way of reason, the signs by way of mere similarity. The orderliness of nature is *evidence* of the divine government, the existence of spiritual creatures is *evidence* of God's spiritual nature. There is a reasonableness about the appeal of such evidence, however wrong it may be to reduce such reason to the form of a hard demonstration. But the signs of deity do not appeal to reason in the same way at all. For example, the sun appears to us a most striking *sign* of deity, and I have already made several applications of it in this discourse. It is a sign of deity because there is (in our minds anyhow) a vivid similarity between the lordship of the sun in the kingdom of light and the lordship of God in the kingdom of being; and the devout mind is moved to adoration and wonder by a contemplation of the sun. But no theistic *evidence* can be found in the sun particularly; nothing is reasonably concluded about the creator from the fact that among his creatures there exists one large conglomerate of incandescent stuff.

Similarly in the realm of Messianic prophecy there are both signs and evidences. The evidences are those texts which represent a serious anticipation of what Christ, when he came, proved to be. Thus the predictions of a Son of David or a Son of Man, or the Isaianic pictures of redemptive suffering conjoined with sanctity—such things as these are evidences of Christ. But there are also to the believing mind most striking signs, which are not evidences, and could scarcely form a part of any argument. How arresting, for example, are those phrases in the psalms which seem exactly to describe the psalmist crucified. *Confoderunt manus meas et pedes:* "They pierced my hands and my feet, they look, and stare upon me, they part my garments among them, and upon my vesture do they cast lots." Such words move and astonish us, but they are plainly no part of a Messianic prediction, except in so far as all innocent suffering faithfully borne is predictive of Calvary, and all righteous blood shed on earth, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zacharias, speaks in the blood of Christ. No special Messianic evidence can be collected from them, but they are nevertheless to us Christians a sign. And to regard them as such is not superstition. For all things are under the providence of God; the sacred text did not fall into the form it retains without the hand of God. It is the same with the signs exhibited by nature. If the sun is a sign of the divine bounty, it is not so without God's appointment. He made the sun, and he made our minds; he is the master of our thoughts. It is no accident, from the point of view of his contriving wisdom, that the sun signifies the deity to us; for, to the divine wisdom, nothing is mere coincidence.

But if we are speaking of the Scriptural signs, the providential configurations of the sacred text, most striking of all, perhaps, is that which (if we are to believe St Justin) most moved the Jew with whom he disputed: I mean the position of the name of Jesus in the Old Testament. The matter is disguised from us by the use of Joshua

in the Old Testament and Jesus in the New. But the names are one. Assimilate them, and what do you find? How is it that these words came to stand in the prophecy of Zechariah? "The angel said, Be silent, all flesh, before the Lord, for he is waked up out of his holy habitation. And he shewed me Jesus the great Priest standing before the Angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to be his adversary." Then, in the sequel, Jesus is justified and Satan condemned, and this is the salvation of all Israel. Or again, lower down in the same prophecy, "Make crowns and set them on the head of Jesus . . . and speak unto him, saying, Behold the Man, the Branch his name, and he shall branch up out of his place and build the temple of the Lord . . . and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne . . . and the counsel of peace shall be between them both." No less wonderful are the significations that hang about the earlier Jesus, the son of Nun, whom we call Joshua, and after whom, presumably, our Saviour was principally named. For how surprising it is that Moses, the patron and the glory of the ancient law, was unable to fulfil his own work, or to bring the people to inherit the promises of God, but was obliged to leave all fulfilment and all victory to a successor, and that successor no other than Jesus. Moreover, this Jesus alone of Old Testament heroes is associated with the cross. For of him alone it is recorded that he crucified the potentates he overthrew. And this prompts St Paul, applying the principle of the *coincidentia oppositorum*, to reflect that the greater Jesus, by himself willingly accepting crucifixion, crucified the hostile powers in his own flesh. The bond that was against us, he says, he abolished, nailing it to the cross; he put off as a garment the principalities and powers, and publicly gibbeted them, triumphing over them on the tree. These surprising significations which follow the name of Jesus are not evidences, but signs only; but they are wonderful none the less, and they are the providences of God.

The founder of this sermon particularly desired that his preacher should address himself to refuting the cavillings of Jewish commentators. And I hope that my argument has done this, in the only sense in which any person of good will would wish to see it done. There is no place for any dispute on points of detail between Jewish scholarship and our own. Whenever Christians and Jews fight for the possession of a single text, we saying "This points to Jesus Christ" and they denying it, the two parties are always arguing at cross-purposes. For by the phrase "points to" the contestants do not mean the same thing. For us Messiah is God, for them he will be but a man. For us, therefore, that which "points to" Messiah points to him as a created thing points to its creator: it points to a fulfilment which is transcendent, superexcellent, and joins opposites in unity. For the Jews there is none of this. What points to Messiah points to him as one creature points to another; it points to a fulfilment which is literal, and lies in the same plane as itself. There is therefore no dispute between the Jews and ourselves on the exegetical level. They are showing what the prophecies mean in the mere sense in which

they were uttered. We are showing how the prophets uttered more than they knew, and how that "more" was wonderfully revealed and actualized by Jesus Christ. For in him it pleased the Father that all the fullness should dwell, and through him to reconcile all things unto himself, that they might ever so remain, tied in the cords of the Holy Ghost.

AUSTIN FARRER.

Great Preachers—VII. John Wyclif

ALTHOUGH John Wyclif was never a great preacher in the sense that he had the silver voice of Chrysostom or the persuasiveness of Whitefield, probably no other man influenced the course of the English sermon before the Reformation more than he. For when Wyclif died, in 1384, he left behind him a whole new philosophy of preaching and a corps of preachers of his own training who were to fix for centuries the pattern of the English sermon.

What made Wyclif a great preacher, first and foremost, was his insistence on the *importance* of preaching. Ever since Christianity had reached the shores of Britain, either with the arrival of Augustine's band in 597 or perhaps before, the islands had produced a few good preachers, notably Aelfric and Wulfstan near the end of the eleventh century. But by and large the Church was an institutional and sacramental church, and many a good Christian in a rural parish never heard more than a dozen sermons in his whole life.

Most clergymen, in fact, had so little training and experience that they could not have produced a moving and listenable sermon even had they wanted. A century before Wyclif, Bishop Peckham found so little preaching in his diocese that he formulated minimal requirements, insisting that the Creed, the Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer, should be publicly expounded from every pulpit at least three times each year. Ever since the invasion of England by the Dominicans and Franciscans in the 1230s and 1240s, preaching had begun to assume more and more stature in the English Church. Even though the wandering friars met hostility from the local clergy —often, a justifiable hostility—the *regulars* at least deserve credit for reaching the common man.

And the single individual who stands out head and shoulders above all the rest in this new accent on preaching is John Wyclif. Though better known as a theologian and as the Morning Star of the Reformation, his stress on the office of preaching, his own sermons, his homiletical treatises, and his training methods, actually make him a significant figure in the history of the sermon.

Born into the same colourful epoch which was to develop a Chaucer, a Langland, and a Froissart, Wyclif was relatively unknown before he became a master at Balliol College, Oxford, in 1356. He was nearly 36 years of age at the time, and his previous studies at the university had fitted him for the new post well. Students flocked to his classroom not only because they liked what he had to say, but because they liked the dynamism and conviction with which he said

it. Soon after, he became prebend at Westbury and Lincoln, later assuming the rectory at Lutterworth. But he always remained close to Oxford and to his teaching.

Historically, Wyclif's crusade for frequent and effective preaching grew from his hatred of the preaching of the friars. Although he would have been the first to admit that they gained considerable popular favour, he resented the methods they used and the doctrines they taught. Most of all he detested their fables and falsehoods, their syllogistic exercises, their bombast and rhyme, their coarse jokes, their *fabliaux*, their ribald illustrations, their trivial and unedifying stories, their dialectic subtleties, and their Thomistic and atomistic subdivisions.

Almost every sermon and tract he ever wrote scores the bad preaching of the friars. On one occasion, for example, he said that "the friars in their preaching destroy the preaching of Christ, and preach only anecdotes and tales which are pleasing to the listeners. And if they happen to touch on a passage from the Law of Christ, they so chop it up and change it that the people do not understand what it means. . . . And so these devils preach the subtlety of themselves, and forget to preach Jesus Christ, and so men are deceived."

Wyclif also did much to stimulate and reform preaching both from his pulpit and from his writing desk. Although he bitterly attacked poor preaching, he was even more caustic toward non-preaching prelates, whom he called "dumb idols" and "waterless clouds". Christ, he insisted, effected more by his preaching than by his miracles.

The evidence for Wyclif's popularity as a preacher stems both from the large audiences which we know followed him and from the mass of his sermons which were preserved. While we have no good account of his style of delivery or his stage presence, other than in general outlines, we know that he was a forceful speaker who could hold attention, if necessary, over long periods, although almost all of his recorded sermons could have been preached in less than fifteen minutes.

As a young preacher, his style was typical of medieval sermons delivered before a university audience. Whether speaking in Latin or English, he freely used Aristotelian metaphysics, quotations from Canon Law, and excerpts from the *patres ecclesiae*. Although these sermons were never structurally so precise as those of his contemporaries, which were carefully divided into a strict sequence of *texta, thema, antithema, dispositio, argumentum, admonitio, exhortatio, applicatio,* and *conclusio*, Wyclif did adhere to a skeletal pattern.

But midway in the reformer's active life, he suddenly developed a whole new insight into the office of the Word. His parish preaching in all corners of the north country convinced him that formal preaching was ineffective, and that to reach the heart of the cobbler in the pew—or the theological student, for that matter—the sermon ought to be more closely tied to the Bible and to the life of his hearer. And thereafter, whether he preached in Latin to an educated audience or in English at a crossroads parish, his method became a

simple exposition of a *pericope* for the day—a "postil", as he loved to call it. And the pattern he initiated has ever since been the bulwark of English preaching.

The rationale which governed Wyclif's preaching was utilitarian and positivistic. He taught that preaching's first goal was the teaching of Biblical truth. To this end he and his co-workers reproduced the Scriptures in English and then publicly expounded their meaning. This stress is best summarized in the tract, "Of the Sufficiency of Holy Scripture". Anything which got in the way of the Bible Wyclif considered a damnable block.

To him, *impedimenta* to preaching included not only the use of stories and fables, as we have already seen, but also singing during the service, the use of poetry, any sort of flowery or metaphorical language, and even the use of a formal pulpit. He once said that "ornamental style is little in keeping with God's Word. The latter is rather corrupted by it, and its power paralyzed for the conversion and regeneration of souls. God's Word, according to Augustine, has a peculiar and incomparable eloquence of its own, in its very simplicity and modesty of form."

Wyclif's English homilies fall into a regular pattern. Those which appear in the Arnold edition of his English works, 274 in number, simply explain the Gospel or Epistle for the day, often without even developing a central theme. Their length averages one thousand to fifteen hundred words, though the pieces for other occasions than Sunday mass are as a rule shorter. The text itself comprises about one-third or one-fourth of the total length, sometimes appearing at the middle or end of his discourse. Some of the sermons seem to have been composed for preachers, since they contain homiletical notes, but others, according to the marginal glosses in the various manuscripts, were actually delivered.

Besides his own philosophy of the sermon and his own impassioned zeal for the pulpit, Wyclif impressed the homiletical stamp of his own mind on the thinking of his friends. These included not only the enthusiastic students who had sat at his feet at Oxford or had heard of him by reputation, but also his university colleagues like Nicolas of Hereford, John Aston, Philip of Repyndon, and John Purvey.

Organizing, training, and indoctrinating these "lollards" or "poor preachers" or "poor priests" (as they came to be termed) in the rectory at Lutterworth, he sent them out across the countryside to preach wherever they could assemble a crowd. And though Wyclif could hardly be considered responsible for all the doctrinal and political aberrations of the Lollard movement, it was he who gave it the core of its sermonic form and style.

The impact of Wyclif upon the Church in England owed its success more to his sermons than to all his treatises and debates. The miracle which he achieved—all the more significant in the light of the opposition which sprang up on every side—was that he and his followers gained such a widespread recognition for their simple preaching of Biblical fundamentals. And so his effect on sermon

methods and his concept of what a sermon should be actually established a new pattern for English preaching.

THEODORE J. KLEINHANS.

Note.—The best edition of Wyclif's English sermons, readily available at most libraries, is *Select English Works of John Wyclif*, edited by Thomas Arnold and printed by the Clarendon Press at Oxford. The second and third volumes contain the sermons. Another reliable and scholarly aid to the evaluation of Wyclif is Herbert B. Workman's *John Wyclif: A Study of the English Medieval Church*, also printed by the Clarendon Press.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Mrs Niebuhr is Associate Professor and Chairman of the Department of Religion at Barnard College, Columbia University, New York City.

The Rev. W. G. Addison is Vicar of Britford, near Salisbury.

Dr Farrer is Chaplain and Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.

Dr Kleinhans is on the staff of the Lutheran World Federation at Geneva.

CORRESPONDENCE

FUNERALS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The correspondence provoked by my article on the pastoral and evangelistic opportunities of funerals confirms my impression that the whole question of funerals needs much more attention from the Church at large than it at present receives. Just as Faith and Order cannot be separated in our theology, no more can our teaching about the future life be considered apart from our practice in the conduct of funerals, and our ministrations consequent upon the death of a Christian.

Mr Lindars writes that "the real work of a priest in the burial of the dead is not to look for 'opportunities', but to get on with the job of burying the Christian". The opportunities do not have to be looked for: they are present in a given situation, where the clergyman is brought face to face with one of the inescapable realities of life. My plea was that the evangelistic opportunities latent in these encounters should be used, and that they were very largely going by default because the New Testament doctrine of resurrection is not being proclaimed with sufficient vehemence and conviction.

Many Christians do not really believe in resurrection, but only in immortality. As W. H. V. Reade points out in *The Christian Challenge to Philosophy*, the immortality of the soul is not a Christian doctrine; it is an importation into Christianity of a Platonic idea. And it has made a tremendously deep impression upon the thinking

of many Christians about death and the future life. Mr Hewson's letter is an excellent illustration of this. He suggests there is a life after death, of whose organization he appears to have some esoteric knowledge, into which we enter as a result of the act of dying. But his language implies that it is not death that he has in mind, so much as persistence. And 1 Pet. 3. 18—4. 6 notwithstanding, I assert that this is not the New Testament faith. In any case, it is dangerous to erect a theology upon the foundation of a single passage of scripture, and that in a book of at least doubtful authorship. It is surely much better to preserve the decent reticence of the Gospels, and to proclaim the apostolic doctrine of death and resurrection in Christ, than to create a system of life beyond the grave for which there is no evidence or authority. To quote W. H. V. Reade again, "to believe in the immortality of the soul is a comparatively primitive achievement; to believe in the resurrection of the body needs a far bolder venture of faith, and a philosophy immeasurably more profound". We must proclaim what the Bible reveals if we desire to minister to man's real necessity.

Mr Lindars' condemnation of funerals by cremation is based upon aesthetic rather than theological grounds. No doubt, many of the incidental details of cremations can be offensive, but this should not be made the basis for a wholesale denunciation of the practice, which has otherwise much to commend it. The Christian hope of resurrection is not affected by the manner in which we dispose of our earthy bodies. But there is a suspicion that much popular support of cremation also goes with a practical agnosticism. And a good deal of the opposition to cremation derives from a crude notion of the New Testament teaching, and an ill-understood idea of resurrection. From a purely practical point of view, it is quite apparent that the vast civic cemeteries on the outskirts of great centres of population cannot expand indefinitely. Where there is a firm grasp of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, and a timely and robust Christian hope, the question of cremation is seen not to be of any great significance.

I wonder in what sense Mr Lindars uses the words "body" and "soul"? And what is the nature of the essential difference he assumes there is between them? For it is something very like nonsense to divide up the ministerial functions of the clergyman officiating at a funeral in the way he does. I may have misunderstood him, but at one point Mr Lindars seems to suggest that the Eucharist is concerned only with the "soul"! Surely, he cannot mean this? Or is it just a piece of special pleading for Requiem Masses? I should have thought that of all the ways in which this practice may be recommended, the defence advanced by Mr Lindars is about as naïve as could well be imagined.

Mr Brown asks me to show "just cause" why the lections from the 7th and 21st chapters of Revelation ought not to be used at funerals, in place of the lesson appointed in the 1662 Prayer Book. A careful reading of his letter supplies the answer. On any of the possible interpretations of the passages, which he briefly outlines, they are in-

appropriate to the occasion and misleading about the matter in hand. When a death occurs, our first concern must be with first things—the fact of death and the assurance of resurrection in Christ. I entirely agree that the passages in question may properly be used for edification, and in a prophetic way—but I submit that a funeral is not the place for this. In any case, the over-riding and practical objection to these lections at funerals is that those who hear them at once transfer the sense of the words to the person whose death they are mourning. And we should never connive at using scripture in a satirical or insincere way.

In the preface to his book *A South India Diary*, Bishop Lesslie Newbigin makes the point that the one question a Christian is never entitled to ask is where he is going to. Much of our ineffectiveness in our ministry at funerals is that we have lacked the virtue of hope, and have tried to imagine what we would like to exist beyond the grave. We have then erected our imaginings into a formal system, and tried to buttress it with theological sanctions. The proper way for a Christian to behave is to recognize what Christ has done, and by penitence to claim his inheritance. Jesus Christ has conquered death, and given us resurrection. What else remains for the Christian is wrapped in the inscrutable counsel of God, of which we have no certain knowledge. This faith, firmly believed and boldly proclaimed, with no watering down and no addition of semi-Christian speculation, will do for our generation what it has always done—it will lead us to the brink of death with hope and courage, for it is the truth by which death is endured and defeated. Where this faith is taught and practised, there the Church may reasonably expect to use funerals for the glory of God and the building up of his people.

I am, Sir,

Yours faithfully,

ERIC WILD.

ST GEORGE'S VICARAGE,
WIGAN.

IN AN UNKNOWN TONGUE

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

May I make an appeal to those who write scholarly books, that when they quote from a foreign language they give the English translation of the passage? In books that have come under my notice recently I have found quotations in Latin, Greek, Italian, German, and French; of the last, quotations extending to half a page. Presumably books written in English are meant to instruct English-speaking people, and of these not merely scholars but also ordinary intelligent readers. To assume that in general such readers can interpret other languages is frankly a foolish assumption. If, on the other hand, it is desired to add instruction by the quotation, to use an unknown language is to defeat the desire. A familiar phrase is that it "is impossible to express this in English". If the writer cannot put it in English, how can he expect ordinary people who know

only their own language to gather anything from it? St Paul's warning about the unknown tongue seems relevant. If you can't interpret a passage, leave it out; but don't spoil the sequence of thought and writing by words from languages of which probably 90 per cent. of the readers know little or nothing.

Yours, etc.,
A. W. Watt.

Christ's College Library,
Alford Place,
Aberdeen.

BOOK REVIEWS

West African Psychology. By G. Parrinder. Lutterworth Press. 25s.

In this book the author of *West African Religion* makes a comparative study of the beliefs of several tribes and sections of tribes in West Africa concerning such matters as the body and its powers, personality-soul, guardian genius, spirit and spirits, the after-life, reincarnation, metamorphosis, possession, dreams. The book is the rich harvest, not only of the author's personal investigations extending over more than ten years spent in West Africa, but also of his very comprehensive reading on these and related subjects.

Where beliefs have never been fixed by committal to sacred text or other stereotype form, but are transmitted only by free verbal repetition and practice, they are naturally exposed to constant modification, as well by the personal understanding of influential interpreters as by local circumstances and history. "Old men" of fully equal authority hardly ever agree about the correct content, or form, or meaning, even where a belief is of long enough standing to have crystallized into a myth, a ceremonial rite, or a "custom". The author very rightly refrains from any attempt at a general synthesis or the construction of a "system" of beliefs of the peoples concerned.

But it would be wrong to infer from this that all the research worker in this field can hope to do is to gather and record pieces of information which otherwise would be lost when the older generation passes on. Chapter 2 of the book on "The African Philosophy of Life" is proof that the masses of apparently unrelated detail may yet yield to the patient, sympathetic, and deep-prying student a true grasp of the situation as a whole and insights of the utmost interest and great practical value.

To non-specialists, this chapter and the last on "The Development of Religion" (also mainly concerned with practical issues) are the ones likely to make most appeal. They give an excellent survey of the present religious situation in West Africa, and contain much eye-opening and food for thought for all who are in any way concerned with the peoples there. The age-old missionary problem of the relation of pagan faiths to Christianity is touched upon, and Dr Parrinder takes up the cudgel against the Barthians. But surely his

plea that evangelists (African as well as European) should make a greater effort to understand these beliefs and practices rather than condemn them outright is valid quite regardless of whether or not these faiths may be regarded as "preparations for Christ".

On the question of connexions with Egypt—a matter of great interest to many educated West Africans to-day—the author's opinion is that the evidence points to a common source of inspiration in prehistoric times rather than to a current diffusion since the emergence of Egyptian civilization.

C. G. Baëta.

London.

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the Pacific LIBRARY

Christ and Western India. By Elizabeth G. K. Hewat. Church of Scotland Book Room, Edinburgh. 8s.

This purports to be a study of the growth of the Indian Church in Bombay city from 1813, and it is within its limitations an admirable piece of historical research and a notable contribution to church history. One thing is certain, that we should cease speaking of the "History of Missions" and think more in terms of new chapters in church history. The early conflict in Bombay city between the missionaries, who would not be restrained from preaching Christ, and the civil authorities, who were most anxious to prevent them from so doing, gives much food for thought. Such men as the American George Bowden, a mystic vowed as much as St Francis to holy poverty, and the brilliant scholar from Scotland, Dr Wilson, deserve to be listed amongst the doctors and confessors of the faith. Dr Paton has suggested that the various churches must act "as if" they were one, and though this referred to future policy Dr Hewat has tried to study the history of the growing church in Bombay, involving as it did the labours of Anglicans. American Congregationalists, and Scottish Presbyterians, just in this way.

One thing is notable. Progress at first was amazingly slow and the pioneers must have become sadly discouraged. Again, the mission boards, especially in America, would seem to have been too much concerned with results. This led to a bitter controversy over the respective merits of higher education and pure evangelism. In time remarkable conversions took place—members of distinguished Parsee families, Muslims, and even Brahmins; and the mission began to become the Church. What is the aim of missions? It is surely, as a distinguished Roman Missiologist has said, to "found the Church", but non-Roman Christianity has been faced with the problem of a divided Christendom and much sectarianism. Yet the difficulties of the work enforced a degree of co-operation from the start, and the problems of reunion are bound to be more acute in the conditions of a non-Christian oriental city than in the western world.

There is no doubt that the Church has taken root in Bombay, but the influence of Christianity is far more widely diffused. Christian schools and such a magnificent centre of higher education as Wilson College influence generations of non-Christians, and one of the re-

sults of the work of missionaries in Western India is the reform of Hinduism.

It is inevitable that such a book as this, written by a Presbyterian and concerned with what the author throughout calls "non-Roman Christianity", will give only the scantiest consideration to the work of the Roman Church, and indeed this is confined to an inadequate appendix which briefly summarizes *Bombay Mission History* by Father Hull, S.J. Yet it is probably true that the vast preponderance of the Christian population of Bombay is Catholic of the Roman obedience, and their educational institutions, such as Xavier's College and the new Sophia College for Women, are immensely influential. Their paper the *Examiner* has a large circulation, and in the late Father Heres Rome had a scholar and Indologist beyond compare.

Anglican work in Bombay is carried on chiefly by the C.M.S. and the Cowley Fathers, and this gets due praise, but the book expressly excludes reference to work amongst Europeans and Anglo-Indians, which has been a great concern of our Church in Bombay. As the book confines its attention to the city it does not refer to the experiment of the Ashram at Poona or the work of the Cowley Fathers there, nor does it mention the Syrian Church. The book deserves praise, but its limited scope may detract somewhat from both its value and its interest.

KANPUR. LEONARD M. SCHIFF.

PASTORAL PSYCHOLOGY: A STUDY IN THE CARE OF SOULS. By Göte Bergsten. Allen and Unwin. 15s.

A main value of this book is that it has as its background the work of St Luke's Foundation in Stockholm, otherwise known as the Institute for Spiritual Counsel and Psychological Treatment, of which the author has been superintendent and chaplain since 1944. This most interesting Swedish experiment is based upon the co-operation of clergy, doctors, and medical psychologists, and it is very clear from the whole tone of the book that modern psychological knowledge is taken fully into account. But the writer's purpose is not, as so often in books of this kind, to illustrate the use and importance of psychological methods in supplementing pastoral care. His main concern is to show that pastoral care ought to have its own technique, taking its religious beliefs and religious ends fully into account. Nevertheless he makes full use of psychological knowledge, and stresses the importance of accurate diagnosis, without which it is impossible to know when and how far a directly religious approach can be carried.

The problem is a very real one, since the customary psychological attitude of religious neutrality is not, in effect, neutrality at all. The argument in favour of this position is "that an emotional struggle is going on in the patient, and that to take the side either of God or the devil is to participate in this struggle", the patient being harmed rather than helped "by the intensification of the conflict produced by the interference". This point of view is rejected, as being based

on a false assumption: "There is no such thing as neutrality in the relations between human beings. Positive attitudes, negative attitudes, and non-committal attitudes, all have real effects upon those with whom we are in association." And thus, though the forces of religion must not be brought into action in ways that will increase tension, or reinforce symptoms which have taken a pseudo-religious pattern, there is a definite and necessary place for Christian counsel. "The form of Christianity that consists only of moral prohibitions and rules of conduct, that talks of Divine love but traffics in fear, is worse than useless to the mentally ill. But that Christianity which is firmly grounded in knowledge of the redemptive love of God and knows the meaning of forgiveness has a message that mentally diseased people deeply need."

A book written, with full psychological knowledge, upon such a basis as this, and going in detail into all the types of problem which confront the pastor, is one which certainly fills a gap in the existing literature.

L. W. Grensted.

Oxford.

Positive Protestantism. By Hugh Thomson Kerr, Jr. Westminster Press, Philadelphia. $2.50.

Dr Kerr calls his book a tract for the times, and he writes out of concern about the present position of Protestantism. Protestant thought is always in danger of being too negative, and undoubtedly Protestants do tend to give the impression that, like the Russian envoys, all they have to say is "No". Mere opposition to Rome cannot be the basis of a positive religion, and a Protestantism which tries to live for ever in a kind of Victorian Conservatism in matters of faith and morals is inevitably doomed to extinction. Dr Kerr is aware of all this and endeavours to counter it by the assertion of a positive Protestantism based upon the proclamation of the Gospel. He regards the Reformation as a deeper plunge into the Gospel, which he describes as the good news that God was in Christ for man's redemption. This message is not a new one invented in the sixteenth century. It is the essential heart of the Christian faith. By living on this faith the Church asserts her continuity with her past and her relevance to the present. By concentrating on the essentials of the Gospel Protestantism can escape both from the negativism of anti-Roman polemics and from the aridity of post-Reformation Scholasticism.

Dr Kerr draws his theological inspiration from three sources—Continental Confessional theology, recent New Testament Interpretation, and the new knowledge of Reformation theology which recent historical research has made available. His book is really an attempt to apply to the present situation of the Protestant Churches the practical lessons to be learnt from these movements of thought. In this connexion what he has to say about the present life of the Church is extremely valuable and timely; his two chapters on "The

New Preaching of the Gospel" and "The Evangelistic Perspective" being particularly good. In vigorous and simple language the book makes clear the contribution which modern Protestant theology has to make to the life of the church. It is no less to be commended for the refreshing novelty of a point of view which allows the author to describe Anglo-Catholics as a "Protestant Group" and to assert that "in their conception of historical continuity the Anglicans are absolutely right".

J. H. Jacques.

South Witham.

From Luther to Wesley. By Franz Hildebrandt. Lutterworth Press. 16s.

Was John Wesley the Anglican version of Luther (as Soederblom said), or of Calvin, or of Zinzendorf? A peculiarly personal interest attaches to Dr Franz Hildebrandt's treatment of such questions. He was formerly Pastor Niemöller's assistant, and a Lutheran of the Lutherans; and his book *EST, Das Lutherische Prinzip* maintained the Lutheran *est* against the Calvinist *significat*. From 1939 onwards he ministered to one of the Lutheran refugee congregations in England; of those who did this work, Dr Hildebrandt alone became a Methodist. "This step", he says, "although in all essentials, outwardly and inwardly, a translation rather than a break, is not without its theological anxieties; the greatest of which was, and is, to avoid the company of Pietism at all costs and in all respects."

Hence this book. It does not deal with the historical influence of Luther on Wesley; but seeks to show that Wesley's doctrine was in all essentials that of Luther, and not the pietist teaching of the Moravians. He then considers both Luther and Wesley in the light of Scripture, with numerous references; and where he admits, as he sometimes does, the defects of either, he shows how the other can correct it, in sections called "The Revival of the Reformation" and "The Reformation of the Revival". A short concluding section shows in detail how Charles Wesley's hymns could be rescued from the pietistic tunes to which they have often been wedded, and set in the Luther-Gerhardt-Bach tradition.

The writer has a very extensive knowledge of the writings of Luther and the Wesleys, and on the whole he seems to make out his case. We wonder, however, whether the strictures on pietism, now popular in many circles, are all entirely deserved. Certainly Methodism was not merely or primarily a pietist movement, despite its debt to the Moravians; yet we wonder whether there were not in Lutheranism (perhaps through a departure from its authentic traditions) some defects which evoked some features of pietism as a necessary corrective; and perhaps something of this better side of pietism is to be seen in Methodism also. The treatment of perfection is of course a crucial issue; and here, as elsewhere, the differences between Luther and Wesley are seen to be smaller than had often been supposed. This section is coloured by the author's pacifism, which he sees as

the logical outcome of the Methodist doctrine of Perfect Love; he does not, of course, attempt to ascribe this teaching to Luther or Wesley.

The author himself indicates what "higher critics" will say, as that the book has two main parts, written at different times, "with some unavoidable repetitions". Could not these have been eliminated, and the whole book, so studded with references, made a little easier to read? Dr Hildebrandt makes good use of the comparisons between Wesley and Calvin made by Cell; but, apart from the forgotten Jellinghaus, he says practically nothing of the literature on the relations between Luther and Wesley; we might have been given references to the works of Scott, von Eicken, and Schmidt. But the work is full of interest, stimulus, and profit, and ought to be widely read.

A. Raymond George.

Wesley College,
Headingley, Leeds.

Essay on Human Love. By Jean Guitton. Translated by M. Chaning-Pearce. Rockliff. 15s.

It is remarkable, and indeed significant, that during the last decade so much attention should have been concentrated upon the theology of marriage, and so little upon the theology of sexual love. For this one-sided emphasis many factors are responsible, not least among them being the tendency to regard marriage institutionally rather than ontologically, and the failure to appreciate that it must be viewed primarily in terms of personal relation. Any attempt to redress the balance is bound to lead to a deeper understanding, not only of marriage, but also of the causes of the disturbing sexual disorder of our time. For this reason alone, M. Guitton's book is important, though it has a value quite independent of its contemporary relevance, and deserves wide and careful study. Moreover, the author touches upon other aspects of human love than that between man and woman, though this love is his principal theme.

There are three main sections in this essay. In the first, M. Guitton discusses and analyses the various expositions of love which man has made. He considers in turn the three great historical themes in which love is expounded: those of Plato, of Solomon (in the Song of Songs), and of Tristan. In dealing with the last of these themes he acknowledges his indebtedness to the interpretation of Denis de Rougement in *Passion and Society*, but he is able to do so without needing to refer to de Rougement's dubious historical theories. Examination of these "Themes of Exaltation" leads M. Guitton to the conclusion that, "owing to the very inadequacy of the physical, love must have a metaphysical explanation. In order to explain love we must go far beyond love." This leads him to a most interesting discussion of the conflict between flesh and spirit.

In the second section the development of the experience of love is traced from its initial crisis of encounter through its fruition in marriage to the third stage of fulfilment, or "assumption", in old age.

Although only short, M. Guitton's treatment of the last of these stages is very fine and full of suggestion; usually it is a stage that is entirely overlooked, yet he shows that it must take a significant place in the pattern of sexual relation.

The last section deals chiefly with the significance of sex, and there is a final chapter on "Conclusions and Perspectives".

This is a book which cannot be summarized, and no review can give an adequate impression of its value. Almost every page throws some new light upon the subject, and sets the reader pondering. There is, for example, a most suggestive and illuminating section upon the true vocation of woman and her future in our society (pp. 210 and 221 ff.) which goes to the root of a pressing though hardly recognized problem. And the chapter on the "initial crisis" in love is particularly good. The reader who is steeped in Charles Williams will find much in this chapter with which he will want to disagree, but in spite of this it will set him thinking.

Incidentally, it is surprising that M. Guitton makes no reference to Charles Williams's thought in connexion with love, though this may be accounted for by the fact that this book was conceived and begun in the restricted conditions of a concentration camp. A comparison between the different approaches of the two writers to their subject is instructive, and both demand careful examination and assessment if progress is to be made in understanding this neglected aspect of personal relation. It is to be hoped that the appearance of M. Guitton's book will stimulate closer study of Charles Williams's theories. and will mark the beginning of a new interest in the nature and significance of sexual love.

A word of praise is due to the translator for his successful accomplishment of what must have proved a difficult task, for M. Guitton's book is more technical and philosophical than the publisher's note on the jacket might lead the reader to expect. In a work of this character, however, why trouble to give footnote translations of Latin phrases in the text? It seems hardly necessary, at any rate, to inform the reader who has mastered more than one hundred pages of theological and metaphysical thought that *amor* means "love"!

Sherwin Bailey.

Edinburgh.

The Coming-of-Age of Christianity. Edited by J. Marchant. Latimer House. 12s. 6d.

This book is better than its title, but not so good as the distinction of its contributors would lead one to expect. There are, however, in it some excellent things, notably the contributions of John Foster and Stephen Neill; these two essays, on "Achievements of Christ in Twenty Centuries" and "The Union of the Churches" respectively, contain in effect the burden of the book, the first half of which attempts a summary of the total contribution of Christianity to the world as we know it, while the second treats of "the Christian Future", the title of one of the essays, that by Scott Latourette, an

essay which provides an excellent compendium, based on his vast knowledge, of the American scholar's conclusions.

Added to the main scheme of the book are essays by the Dean of St Paul's and by Professor A. D. Ritchie on "The Significance of Christ through the Ages" and "Science and the Christian Life": the former appeals for a reinterpretation of Christology which will incorporate current psychological insights, though it would seem that early optimism concerning that study has not been sufficiently fulfilled to warrant the abandonment of the ontological and soteriological approach to Christology which the labours of the Fathers canonized as Christian orthodoxy. It is distressing, moreover, still to find Dr Matthews upbraiding Dr R. H. Lightfoot for the now notorious concluding sentence of his Bampton Lectures.

The main criticism, however, which will be levelled against this book is in the vague and untheological speculation of its closing chapters. One example must suffice: Dr Latourette asserts (p. 122) that though progress towards the Christian goal is "to be seen within history", yet nevertheless before that goal is reached "history will cease". But to postulate an eschaton which is outside or beyond the historical process is in fundamental opposition to the primitive Christian view of God's *οἰκονομία* (as expounded, for instance, in Oscar Cullmann's newly translated *Christ and Time*) in which the *parousia* is an integral part of redemptive history.

The book suffers more than is necessary from that occupational disease of all symposia—reiteration. In each of the last three chapters nineteenth-century missionary achievement, its outcome in the ecumenical movement, and the present hope for and threat to Christianity, are summarized in almost identical terms. It would have been more profitable if some constructive analysis of the shape of Christian history, the potentialities for both good and evil inherent in any one moment or idea, could have been offered. Or one could have wished that such a statement as "the religious awakenings of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries have been among the most potent sources of the growing movement towards Christian unity" (p. 173) had been more fully expounded, in view of the *prima facie* evidence to the contrary which the rise of Methodism and the Salvation Army seems to offer. Finally there is absolutely no mention of the contribution which Christians have made to the aesthetic treasure of mankind. Some attempted analysis of the vision of Fr Angelico and El Greco, of Donne, Herbert, and Vaughan, even of Butterfield, Pearson, and Street, would have been both valuable and interesting —an analysis perhaps along the lines suggested by Professor Ritchie in his insistence that the inspiration of such men as Pasteur was primarily intuitive and sacramental. At the moment specifically aesthetic insights are apt to be claimed, by default, only by Roman Catholic writers.

Barry Till.

Bury.

THE BOOKS AND THE PARCHMENTS. By F. F. Bruce. Pickering and Inglis. 12s. 6d.

The head of the Department of Biblical History and Literature in Sheffield University writes for the "ordinary Bible student" about the language and scripts of the Bible, the text, canon, and versions. The theme is familiar, but not the treatment. Mr Bruce thinks with his readers, explaining names like Peshitta and Vulgate, answering questions about the wall writing at Belshazzar's feast, the significance of our Lord's use of the Aramaic *Abba*, the meaning of *paraskeue* in reference to the date of the crucifixion, why Manasseh is the *qere* for Moses as the grandfather of the priest at Dan. Sources not readily accessible are quoted at length. Picturesque details make the theme live, like the Baptist according to Tatian being a vegetarian, the Gothic "Silver Codex" on purple vellum, the differences between early and recent editions of the Authorized Version. Incidentally attention is called to features often unrealized—the institutional criterion of *Kings* and the prophetic of *Chronicles*; the lateness of MSS for ancient books in general; the doubtfulness of an "Alexandrian Canon" as distinct from the Palestinian. Speaking of Jewish questioning of certain books, it might have been indicated that of the "catholic epistles" only *1 John* and *1 Peter* are "books of whose authority there was never any doubt in the Church". The "ordinary" reader may feel the demand upon him a little high in, e.g., the Hebrew grammatical details (further examples of idiom would better have displayed the genius of the language); yet this like other packed chapters will make useful reference. More is present, however, than information about the Bible; form and content are seen as a witness to Christ. If some criticism may be made of theology—the Old Testament is more than preparation for the Incarnation, and of religious and ethical "value"; nor is the revelation of God *in* history so much as *by* history—this does not lessen the impressive presentation of the Bible in the light of Christ. The theological as well as the general student will profit.

T. E. N. PENNELL.

MUCH WENLOCK.

SHORTER NOTICES

THE GOSPEL IN SLOW MOTION. By Ronald Knox. Sheed and Ward. 8s. 6d.

Those who have read Mgr Knox's previous "slow-motion" books on the Mass and the Creed may find themselves deceived by the title of this third work. Like its predecessors, it is a collection of sermons preached to the girls of a convent school during war-time, but these do not form a continuous course: they are not all about the Gospels; some of the best are expositions of Sunday epistles, some of the liveliest are brief lives of Saints, though, of course, as the author points out, these are very much pertinent to the Gospel. Though perhaps deceived, readers will not be disappointed, and

may well find these addresses useful unpietistic devotional reading. Mgr Knox's powers of translation and exegesis are well seen. He writes with a nice blend of classical and schoolgirl English. He certainly must have made his points delightfully clear to the girls, even to what they should do if, alas! they should take Protestant husbands. It must have been great stuff for Vb, but for all the exegesis there remains the question whether Va and VI form found it a little slick, or don't these forms ask their usual questions in schools of such persuasion?

J. H. CHURCHILL.

TOTTENHAM.

THE GOSPEL OF GOD. By Anders Nygren. Translated by L. J. Trinterud. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

Bishop Nygren is, of course, well known in this country as a theologian and a prominent member of the ecumenical movement. This small volume, a translation of his pastoral letter to the clergy of the diocese of Lund, is valuable in two principal ways. First, it is a complete refutation of those who criticize the appointment of scholars as bishops. It shows how a theologian can aid the parochial clergy in their work by helping them to keep to the point of their ministry. In these days, when efficiency and social activities are admired and often urged indiscriminately upon the clergy, it is good to hear a bishop proclaiming that their primary responsibility is to the Gospel. Bishop Nygren urges them to remember that pastoral work is not to be based on general moral principles, but on the conviction that the Gospel is the truth of God. They are not here to preach a system of thought or a social policy which goes by the name of Christianity, but the living Christ. Second, it is useful for Anglicans to be reminded of the Lutheran Church. It is beside the point whether we agree in all details. But we ought to be glad to be reminded, from whatever quarter, that we are here to minister the Gospel and nothing less. Bishop Nygren has many valuable and striking things to say about the Gospel in preaching, in the sacraments, in teaching, and in pastoral work. He points out the weakness of what F. D. Maurice called a "religion about God", and the strength of religion based on a personal faith in Christ. Here, in a compact, readable, and inspiring form, is something which we need.

P. R. P. BARKER.

WOOLAVINGTON.

THE UNCURTAINED THRONE. By Warner Allen. Faber and Faber. 12s. 6d.

This is the third book written by this author in an attempt to develop a theory of human consciousness into which he can fit his own mystical experience. The first half of the book is devoted to demonstrating "the presence within the self of a subject who comprehends his own existence" (p. 113), against a materialistic view of human con-

sciousness which reduces it to a mere "bundle of experiences". The author distinguishes between the psyche, which is indeed such a bundle, and is itself quite devoid of consciousness, and the conscious self, which is able to comprehend and use these stored-up experiences. As an interesting confirmation of this belief he cites a recent series of scientific experiments which are said to have demonstrated the existence in the human mind of powers whose nature lies outside the range of scientific categories: the powers of "extra-sensory perception" and "psycho-kinesis".

The Christian reader will certainly not wish to dispute the existence of these "spiritual" forces in human nature. He will, however, contest the assumption made throughout the second half of the book (in spite of an explicit statement on p. 113 that such an assumption is unnecessary to the argument) that this element in man is to be identified with the Spirit of God, or the "divine spark". This identification makes the author unable to take with full seriousness the element of sin in man, which in fact only orthodox Christianity has ever taken properly into account.

Mr Allen dissents from an extreme mysticism which denies any meaning to physical existence, and one must applaud the insight which leads him to say that the divine Spirit has a purpose for the universe, and that mystical experience makes a man better able to live this present life; but he is unable to appreciate the true meaning of Incarnation and Redemption, because on his view of man the only barrier to mystical union is our failure to develop our intuitive faculties adequately.

R. N. WHYBRAY.

MYSTERY MAN. By Aloysius Roche. Burns Oates. 10s. 6d.

Mystery Man is not quite the thriller which the title suggests, nevertheless it is a most pleasing account of what the priestly vocation means, how vocations arise, the Church's dealings with her "priestlings", the Divine Office, the Mass, the Confessional, the first curacy, the country curacy, stipends, clothes, habits, indeed there is hardly a point of the priest's life which is not touched on with grace and charm. The sub-title "the Catholic priest explained" is another question; only those who are such priests will find this true. There are many little windows opened for us to peer at the priest, yet the layman and the non-Roman clergyman will always find "the Catholic priest" beyond them. There is a segregation of the Roman clergy which effectively marks them off—for ever. It matters not how well one gets to know them, they possess a shared understanding of habit, tradition, and life which sets them apart. How one would like to know of life in a seminary, not in any merely inquisitive sense, but the particular external and internal experience of the priest's training is quite unrevealed in this book. The author is at great pains to show that the individual variety of character triumphs over the whole system of priest-making. No doubt in a sense this is true, but the individual character is also impressed with the new character of priest which is shared in an extraordinary manner amongst the

Roman clergy. This mystery remains, yet the author does reveal himself: how charitable, charming, and priestly he must be! There is wide reference to changing practices and differing outlooks at varying epochs of the history of the Church, and all this quite objectively; we are not expected to believe that the Apostles behaved ecclesiastically like the medieval or modern college of cardinals. Almost every page has a sentence worth remembering, and a really holy sense of humour penetrates the book.

C. J. GARDNER.

WANTAGE.

CHRISTIAN WITNESS IN COMMUNIST CHINA. By Barnabas. S.C.M. Press. 4s.

This is without doubt the fullest, best informed, and most balanced account of the situation of the Chinese Church. I imagine that every "old China hand" in the mission world will wish to correct this or that emphasis: I think myself that it is a little too schematic. (Like so many of us intellectuals, "Barnabas" carries round with him a Procrustean bed, which the facts have to fit. His is commodious and cunningly wrought: but even so the occupant is a bit uneasy.) I think also that he is too hard on the "progressive Christian leaders". But these are relatively minor points. The book should be widely read, and not only by those who are concerned with "missions". There is much that can be learned for our use from the experience of the Church in China; and, moreover, our repetition of the "I believe One Holy Catholic Church" of the Creed is vain repetition if it does not accompany a concern for the other members of the body.

AMICUS.

A PROCESSION OF PASSION PRAYERS. By E. Milner White. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

This collection of prayers is designed "to pass through the incidents of the Passion in a pilgrimage of prayers for private use". The Dean of York's skill in making prayers which draw on a great range and wealth of traditional sources is well known. The book is beautifully printed and can be recommended for use in Passiontide and on Fridays throughout the year.

GUIDE TO THE RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION. Mowbray. 5s.

This useful work of reference has been issued by the Advisory Council on Religious Communities. It contains information about all Religious Communities in the Anglican Communion, not only in the provinces of Canterbury and York, and it indicates clearly whence further information can be obtained about each community.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM. By Thomas Corbishley, S.J. Hutchinson's University Library. 7s. 6d.

A workmanlike account of Roman Catholic belief and practice and of the ecclesiastical system. The book has the character of a temperate apologia. It is curious that there is no mention either of the inerrancy of the Bible or of the Assumption of the Virgin.

THE READER'S BIBLE. 30s. (India paper edition, 45s.)

This handsome new edition of the Bible, published by the three Privileged Presses, contains the complete text of the Authorized Version with the Apocrypha. It also contains the original preface, "The Translators to the Reader", and short, scholarly introductions to each main section of the Bible. The division of the text into verses is entirely abandoned, and it is printed in paragraphs like any other book. It is beautifully printed, and will contribute as much to the pleasure as to the profit of Bible-reading.

A. R. V.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

BURNS OATES: J. C. Hedley, *Bishop Hedley's Retreat* (First published in 1894) (16s.).

CHURCH INFORMATION BOARD: R. Stokes (Ed.), *The Churchman's Handbook* (3s. 6d.).

EDITIONS DU SEUIL (PARIS): Henri de Lubac, S.J., *Aspects du Bouddhisme* (n.p.).

FABER: R. Duncan, *Our Lady's Tumbler* (8s. 6d.).

GALLEONS LAP (UPPER WILLINGDON, SUSSEX): A. M. P. Dawson, *A New Metrical Version of the Psalter* (4s. 3d., post free).

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS: George H. Williams, *The Norman Anonymous of 1100 A.D.* (n.p.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: G. D. Henderson, *The Claims of the Church of Scotland* (15s.).

HUTCHINSON: C. T. Chapman, *The Conflict of the Kingdoms* (7s. 6d.).

MOWBRAY: C. L. Berry, *A Plea for the Prayer of Oblation* (n.p.).

NISBET: Leonard Hodgson, *The Doctrine of the Atonement* (10s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: J. E. L. Newbiggin, *A South India Diary* (7s. 6d.); F. C. Synge, *Philippians and Colossians* (6s.).

S.P.C.K.: E. Allison Peers, *Studies of the Spanish Mystics* [New and revised edition; the first edition was reviewed in THEOLOGY, May, 1927, pp. 303–309] (22s. 6d.); J. S. Purvis (Ed.), *The York Cycle of Mystery Plays* (7s. 6d.); K. M. Baxter, *Gerald of Wales* (3s.); Marcus Knight, *Ends and Means in Christian Education* (1s.); S. G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church* (30s.); *Should a Christian be a Freemason?* [Reprint of articles, etc., in THEOLOGY, January to May, 1951] (1s.); *Church Commissioners for England* (1s.).

TYNDALE PRESS: N. B. Stonehouse, *The Witness of Luke to Christ* (7s. 6d.); C. Van Til, *The Intellectual Challenge of the Gospel* (2s.).

EMMANUEL VITTE (PARIS): *Le Christ Réconciliateur des Chrétiens* (200 frs.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher